IN THE DRAWINGS

Attached are Replacement Sheets showing Figures 1 and 2 that have been amended to include the reference characters used in the specification to describe the illustrated elements. No new matter is added by the change.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, rejected claim 1 under the second paragraph of section 112, rejected claims 1 – 3 as obvious over the Kargupta reference in view of the Kamath reference and the publication of Cho and Wuthrich, and cited additional references of record without being relied upon.

Drawing Objection

The drawing Figure 1 has been amended to include the reference numbers used in the description. Figure 2 has also been amended to include the same reference numbers. These reference numbers were in the text of the specification as filed. Applicant submits that no new matter is added by the drawing amendment.

35 USC 112, 2nd ¶

Claim 1 has been amended to remove the reference to value selection, so that the rejection is overcome.

The claimed best attribute is supported in the patent specification. In particular, the specification at page 3 states at step 2 that each agent finds the feature or attribute that can <u>best</u> split the data into the various training classes, i.e. the attribute with the highest information gain (emphasis added). The claim has been amended to better define what is intended by best. No new matter is added by the change.

35 USC 103(a)

The Kargupta reference discloses generating a set of orthogonal basis functions that define the data model. By contrast, the present invention computes the most optimal local condition using features available in the database. In Kargupta, a strength level of a class prediction by a plurality of classifiers defined by a set of coefficients is evaluated. By contrast, the present invention, the best local conditions are compared to one another.

The Kamath reference discloses a parallel object identifying module and a parallel feature extracting module and a parallel pattern recognition algorithm module. In contrast, the

5

present invention provides that each agent generates local optimal conditions. The conditions are generated using a subset of a global features set.

The Cho reference discloses mining for information in distributed data wherein from each data source only one rule is generated. The individual rules are brought together to represent the knowledge of the entire database. The rules generated at each location are assembled as a rule set and are distributed to the database globally. In other words, the distributed databases result in disjointed rules, that are then assembled into a set of rules.

By contrast, the present invention provides that each local database has an agent that computes the most optimal rule for the local conditions. No complete set of rules is generated by the individual agents. A centralized mediator receives the rules from the agents in the distributed and chooses the globally optimal condition. This condition is input to a rule set structure and us used to partition or split the data both at the location at which the rule originated as well as globally by broadcasting the rule to other agents to partition the data accordingly. The system then starts the same collaborative process again using locally generated rules and determining a most optimal condition on a global scale using the data from one of the distributed agents.

Thus, none of the prior art references relied on show the features of the invention and do not suggest such features. There is no suggestion in the prior art to modify the teachings of the prior art references, even when considered in combination, to provide the features as defined in the claims. As such, the invention as defined in the present claims is a non-obvious improvement over the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all claims is therefore in order.

Additional Art

The additional art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon is noted by the Applicant.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Melvin A. Robinson (Reg. No. 31,870)
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-258-5785
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on June 5, 2006.

DC\ 7025290.1

7